1 (Case called)

MR. LIU: My name is Frank Liu, the plaintiff.

MR. SMITH: This is Aubrey Smith from Winston & Strawn for the defendants.

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. I am Judge Wang on the line.

Mr. Liu, it is good to hear from you again.

We are here now for a public status conference. We are proceeding by telephone. This is a public line. It should be treated like my virtual courtroom. I expect the same decorum and manners on the line that I expect in my courtroom. And because this is a public line, we should all expect the members of the press or public may be on the line on a listen-only basis.

I wanted to make very clear to everyone that this is a public status conference and it is not like the confidential calls that we had earlier in the year. We do have a court reporter on the line, and nobody else should be recording or rebroadcasting this conference.

In order for us to have a clear transcript, I am going to ask the parties to stay on mute when you are not talking, to please say your name when you start speaking. Please do not interrupt each other. Please make sure to speak slowly and clearly because if you speak too quickly and the court reporter can't get your words down, we are going to have to ask you to

1 | stop and say things more slowly.

A failure to follow these ground rules may result in muting or expulsion from the conference and, in egregious cases, sanctions.

As I just said, we did have a number of calls to try to settle the case earlier this year, and we were not able to resolve the case. I may go off the record with you both after we are done with the public part of the conference, but I think right now what we need to do is get some understanding of what we are going to be doing if you are going to be going forward with litigation. In other words, if we are not able to settle the case, we need to set some deadlines.

Has there been an answer filed yet?

Let me ask Mr. Smith first. Procedurally, are we still waiting on defendants' motion or answer? Where are we procedurally with the case?

MR. SMITH: Thank you, your Honor.

Following the first complaint, we filed a motion to dismiss. Mr. Liu then filed an amended complaint that we understand to be submitted untimely. If the Court accepts that complaint, we do intend to file a motion to dismiss, so we would need just a briefing schedule on that. But that would be defendants' intention, will be to file a motion to dismiss the amended complaint.

THE COURT: Talk to me very briefly. I just want to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

within four weeks, but I file an amended complaint.

THE COURT: Mr. Liu, you're saying you believe you have four weeks to file an amended complaint and you filed your amended complaint within that four weeks?

MR. LIU: Correct. I believe -- I don't recall off the top of my head right now, but I believe in their motion to dismiss, in their header, or whatever the first paragraphs or the notice of motion, they said something about four weeks.

THE COURT: OK. Regardless, let me hear from defense counsel why you believe that the amended complaint was untimely.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, it is not my understanding that he had a month to file the amended complaint. I do believe it took him about four weeks to put it in. When we calculated what the deadline was for him to submit an amended complaint under those rules, we understood it to be several days prior to when it was filed.

I don't believe that we filed any sort of a motion to strike it, but it was our understanding that for it to be the operative complaint, it would require the Court granting leave since it was untimely and we had not received that yet. That was why we had not moved forward with briefing a motion to dismiss the amended complaint, which added several claims there.

The first complaint was, I believe, limited to the Title VII claim. The new complaint has several additional claims, which we do believe the substantive claims to be untimely.

So if the Court moves forward with accepting this amended complaint, then we would ask that the Court provide us with a briefing schedule to submit a motion to dismiss.

THE COURT: Why don't we set the briefing schedule. To hear that Mr. Liu believed that he had four weeks to file and he thought he was complying with the deadline, and it sounds like even if he was wrong about four weeks, he would have been off by only a few days. So given that Mr. Liu is

25

Mr. Smith, would defendants be amenable to providing the New Jersey workers comp case file to Mr. Liu either during or -- during the pendency of the motion to dismiss, or are you intending to file a request to stay discovery?

MR. SMITH: It's something I would like to talk with my client about, your Honor. I am not sure if they have any concerns around providing those documents. Frankly, I am not sure that they have them, just because I had not. Regarding a request for workers comp, I think, as a general matter, they would prefer to stay discovery until there is a ruling on the motion to dismiss because I think that it may significantly affect what the scope of appropriate discovery is in this case.

THE COURT: I hear you.

Why don't you reach out to your client, discuss that, and in a separate letter, and it can be a letter brief or letter motion to stay discovery, if you want to, we will make that due January 26 as well.

What I'm asking you to do is to talk to your client and see whether they can agree or would agree to provide the New Jersey workers comp file that Mr. Liu just identified. I am not inclined and this should not be taken -- even if they agree to provide the workers comp file, this should not be construed to be wholesale starting discovery full-bore discovery on every single claim in the amended complaint. It's just this one thing that Mr. Liu has asked for, whether you can

the transcript and provide a copy to Mr. Liu. Then we will go

(Adjourned)

24

25

off the record.